REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated December 1, 2006, the Examiner states that claims 1-25 are pending, claims 1-25 are rejected and claims 5 and 12 are objected to. Moreover, the abstract, title, specification and drawings were objected to. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the abstract, the title, the specification, the claims, and the drawings.

In the Office Action, Figure 2a was objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because it contains reference character angle "a" which is not mentioned in the description. The reference character in the original drawing was incorrect, and it has been corrected and is now reference character α in the replacement drawing. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests this objection be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the abstract was objected to for exceeding the maximum allowable length of 150 words and for the usage of legal phraseology. The abstract has been amended to remove legal phraseology, and to shorten the length to 150 words; therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests this objection be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to for not being descriptive. The title has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to more descriptively indicate that invention to which the claims are directed. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to for several grammatical, spelling, and numbering informalities. The Applicant has corrected each cited informality according to the Examiner's suggestions, and respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claim 5 was objected to for including a reference number. This claim has been cancelled; and thus this objection should be considered overcome. Claim 12 was objected to because the word "wherein" is missing. The Applicant has amended the claim according to the Examiner's suggestion, and therefore, this claim objection should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 3-4, 9, 12-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Truhan (U.S. 3,511,162). Claims 1-2 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truhan in view of

Hirsch (DE 2851046 A1). Additionally, claims 5-8, 18-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truhan in view of Nillson (U.S. 4,781,108). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truhan. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truhan in view of Lindestrom (U.S. 3,726,203). Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truhan in view of Nillson as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Lindestrom. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truhan in view of Hirsch as applied to claim 23 above, and in further view of Sodec (U.S. 5,054,379). Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truhan in view of Hirsch and Sodec as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Gustavsson (U.S. 4,131,059).

With respect to the claims, the Applicant has made several minor revisions to dependent claims 7, 12, 13, 14 and 22. Specifically, claim 7 has been amended to claim the angle α. Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 8, rather than claim 9, and to claim the acute angle GAMMA between the depth axes of each slot. Claims 13 and 14 have also been amended to specifically claim the angle GAMMA. Claim 22 has been amended to add the word "wherein" before "said width" to more specifically define the subject matter of the claim.

The Applicant has also made amendments to independent claims 1, 3, 16, and 23. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate features of claim 2 and to add features relating to the arrangement of the slots. Claim 2 has been amended to remove that which was added to claim 1, and to further claim that the guiding slot diffuser has two slots. Independent claim 3 has been amended to incorporate the features of claims 4 and 5, and to add features relating to the arrangement of the slots. Accordingly, claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled, and claim 6 has been amended to depend from claim 3, rather than claim 5. Independent claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the features of claims 17 and 20, and to add features relating to the arrangement of the slots. Claims 17 and 20 have been cancelled. Independent claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the method step "providing the first flow of air by forcing air through two elongated slots having converging axes of depth" of claim 25, while claim 25 has been amended to remove the above-mentioned method step. Dependent claim 24 has

been amended to remove the language that is now in amended independent claim 23 from the incorporation of the method step of claim 25.

The Applicant considers the amendments to independent claims 1, 3, 16, and 23 overcome the rejections to those claims, and the claims dependent thereon.

The current amendments to independent claims 1, 3 and 16 overcome the anticipation rejection with respect to Truhan. Truhan discloses a device having spaces between plates 33 and 34 for providing a clean air stream of relatively high speed and small volume to a patient in a bed, and it discloses a perforated plate for providing a slow speed and large volume of air between the spaces at approximately the same magnitude of the bed itself. However, Truhan does not disclose a guiding slot diffuser to prevent the spaces between the plates 33 and 34 from co-ejecting non-controlled air from the area surrounding the space as claimed in the present invention. Truhan does not disclose a guiding slot diffuser with two slots that has an acute angle between the depth axes of the two slots which directs an airstream towards the surface of an underlying bed by converging airflow of the higher velocity airflows from the slots, as claimed in the present invention. The air directing structure 30 in Truhan provides to allow for even flow of air, and does not have an acute angle. Therefore, Truhan does not anticipate amended claim 1, and the rejections to independent claims 1, 3, 16, and all claims dependent thereon should be deemed overcome.

Furthermore, Hirsch, Nillson, Lindestrom, and Sodec do not claim the arrangement of the slots as claimed in the amended claims 1, 3, and 16. Therefore, the present invention is not obvious to Truhan in view of Hirsch, Nillson or Lindestrom. Consequently, the obviousness rejections to the independent claims 1, 16, and all claims dependent thereon should be deemed overcome.

The current amendment to independent claim 23 overcomes the obviousness rejections with respect to Truhan in view of Hirsch and Truhan in view of Hirsch and Sodec. Truhan discloses providing the first flow of air by forcing the air through at least one space parallel to a vertical plane parallel to a side of a bed and providing a second flow of air by forcing air through a perforated plate. Hirsch discloses an air discharge device that includes a discharge grid for supplying primary air having low pressure, a divided air channel with a spray nozzle positioned in the center of the grid for supplying secondary air that has a higher pressure and a lower volume.

Sodec discloses an air release box for supplying clean air to a room, which has wall sections made of sheet metal and apertures that preferably occupy 20% to 30% of the total wall area. However, Truhan, Hirsch, nor Sodec alone or in combination teach or suggest two elongated slots with converging axes of depth as is claimed in the present invention. Therefore, that which is claimed in amended independent claim 23 is not obvious to Truhan, Hirsch or Sodec.

With respect to the obviousness rejection based on Truhan in view of Hirsch, Sodec, and Gustavsson, the Applicant respectfully disagrees and transverses the rejection. Figure 3 of Gustavsson discloses a device that has slots that are spaced apart half the distance of the width of the room, unlike the present invention that claims the slots are in proximately arranged. Additionally, Gustavsson discloses a perforate partition means, for example a perforate ceiling, and does not disclose a perforated sheet adjacent to the slots as is claimed in the present invention. Gustansson does not teach or suggest that which is claimed in the present invention. Therefore, the present invention is not obvious to Truhan in view of Hirsch, Sodec and Gustavsson.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

June 1, 2007
Date

Attorney for Applicant
W. William Park
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613